

REMARKS

In response to the November 17, 2006 Office Action, Applicants respond to Examiner's detailed action with the following remarks. Claims 14, 20, 21, and 23-26 are currently pending, and are all rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §112

Applicants acknowledge Examiner's new matter rejection and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection. Applicants traverse Examiner's rejection based on new matter to the claims. Applicants maintain that there is no new matter with respect to the prior amendment, because the amendment would have been understood by one skilled in the art. It is believed that the Examiner rejects claim 14 because Applicants have used the language "a drift region lightly doped with one polarity," and specifically that Examiner rejects the use of the language "drift." However, it is readily known in the art that power semiconductors, such as the power MOSFETs, have drift regions; these regions are inherent in the structure of power devices. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have understood that a drift region would be inherent in the structure as disclosed in the application, and would not believe that any new matter was present in the claims. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended the claims to delete the adjective "drift," thereby maintaining the structural definition of the device. Support can be found, at least, in paragraph 0011 of specification and in Figure 2. No new matter is added to the claims, and, therefore, no new issues are present.

Claims 20, 21, and 23-26 all depend either directly or indirectly from claim 14, and, therefore, were rejected as incorporating new matter. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the new matter rejection of claim 14 and its dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants believe that all the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.


Applicants appreciate the opportunity to call the Examiner, but believe that this amendment to the claims and the foregoing remarks fully address the issues raised by the

Appl. No. 10/618,067
Resp. Dated January 17, 2007.
Reply to Office Action of November 17, 2006.

Examiner. On the other hand, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if he has any matters to address that will facilitate allowance of the application.

In the event that Applicant has overlooked the need for an extension of time, additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicants hereby conditionally petition therefore and authorize that any changes be made to Deposit Account No.: 50-3010.

Respectfully submitted,
HISCOCK & BARCLAY, LLP

By: 
Alpa V. Patel, Esq.
Reg. No. 58, 196
2000 HSBC Plaza
100 Chestnut Street
Rochester, NY 14604
Tel: (585) 295-4438
Fax: (585) 295-8459